



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,665	06/27/2003	Kathryn G. Rasmussen	5486-0115PUS1	8043
67321	7590	10/21/2008		
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP			EXAMINER	
PO Box 747			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2173		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/21/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/607,665

Applicant(s)

RASMUSSEN ET AL.

Examiner

DENNIS G. BONSHOCK

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13, 15-20 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment as received on 7-1-2008.

Claims 1-25 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22, 23, and 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al., Pub. No.: US 2003/0056026 A1, hereinafter Anuff, Kanevsky at al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0089546 A1, hereinafter Kanevsky, and Olander et al., Pub. No.: US 2005/0005243 A1, hereinafter Olander.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al., Pub. No.: US 2003/0056026 A1, hereinafter Anuff, and Olander et al., Pub. No.: US 2005/0005243 A1, hereinafter Olander.

Claims 4, 14, and 21 have been cancelled by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically:

- no support had been pointed out by the applicant nor could any be found in the specification for the “framework” being “related to a data-level to an application-level relationship (see claims 1, 8, 19, and 24).
- no support had been pointed out by the applicant nor could any be found in the specification for “shrinking” “after the creating an instance that associates the same data type between the data-level and the application-level” (see claims 1, 8, and 19)

Please provide specific page and line numbers of specification where above citations are believed to be supported.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22, 23, and 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al., Pub. No.: US 2003/0056026 A1, hereinafter Anuff, Kanevsky at al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0089546 A1, hereinafter Kanevsky, and Olander et al., Pub. No.: US 2005/0005243 A1, hereinafter Olander.

3. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a system for simplified implementation of adaptable user interfaces, the system comprising: at least one content module that contains content, wherein the content is unformatted with respect to visual characteristics; at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements, where the interface optionally doesn't have a default branding. With regard to claim 1, which further teaches a framework, wherein at least one of the at least one content module and the at least one navigation module are inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links, where a plurality of containers (panes) are configured to accept content (see paragraph 157 and figure 18). With regard to claim 1, which further teaches a database descriptor, and a framework related to a data-level to an application-level relationship of the at least one content module that contains content, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 53, and 76, which teach a database management system that retrieves data and employs in the framework, where data from a data-level is used in producing the structure of the web page at the application-level (see paragraph 136). With regard to claim 1, which further teaches a formatting specification that includes a standardized set of flexible styles, attribute of which are set for defining a plurality of visual characteristics of at least one of the at least one content module, the at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a

collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure). With regard to claim 1, which further teaches said visual characteristics instantiating and displaying at least a portion of the framework after at least one content module is inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, site content being combined with a framework defining visual characteristics with a specific look and feel.

Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state a framework with a plurality of containers configured to accept on or more modules of containers. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 28, 34, and claims 1 and 9, a framework where controls (tables) serve as containers for other controls, setting up a system with a plurality of tables with an imbedded set of containers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the adaptable pane system of Anuff to include the hierarchical embedding of elements into tables, as did Olander. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Anuff points out the structure of sites and sub-site, which could logically be implemented in the imbedded content tables of Olander, to further organize content.

With regard to claim 1, which further teach wherein if one of said plurality of container does not contain a module or another container after creating an instance of

the at least one navigation module that associates the same data type, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers, that already created for display, based on the content inserted into the container, where it would be obvious that a window with no content would effectively disappear (see paragraph 10). Kanevsky show the advantage of this in allowing for a transparent window that reveals hidden content (see above citation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allows for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling and without consuming extraneous screen space.

4. With regard to claim 2, which further teaches wherein at least one of said plurality of containers includes at least one row that includes at least one column, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 135 and in figure 20, the framework including at least one container that includes at least one row that includes at least one column.

5. With regard to claims 3 and 13, which further teach wherein when a content module or navigation module is inserted into one of said plurality of containers, the

container expands to fit the inserted content module or the inserted navigation module, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where a user sets a minimum and a maximum window dimension. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling.

6. With regard to claims 5, 15, and 22, which further teach wherein the standardized set of styles is instantiated in a Cascading Style Sheet document, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state using Cascading Style Sheets. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches applying a look and feel through the use of cascading style sheets (CSS) (see paragraph 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the formatting method of Anuff to made use of CSS. One would have been motivated to make such a

combination because CSS are known in the art to provide appearance information to web documents.

7. With regard to claims 6 and 16, which further teach wherein the plurality of visual characteristics are selected from: colors; heights, widths, spacing around an element, spacing within an element, background images, borders, and fonts, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 134, and 135, visual characteristics including colors, fonts (letter height and width), layout characteristics, image files, and spacing around elements, for applying specific style attributes to content.

8. With regard to claims 7, 9, 12, and 18, which further teach web-page user interface generated by the system of claim 1, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 135, the system being implemented for web-page user interface generation.

9. With regard to claim 8, which teaches a method of providing at least one adaptable user interface, the method comprising: inserting at least a first content module and at least a first navigation module into a framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links, where a plurality of containers (panes) are configured to accept content (see paragraph 157 and figure 18). With regard to claim 8, which further teaches a database descriptor, and a framework related to a data-level to an application-level relationship of the at least one content module that contains content, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 53, and 76, which teach a database management

system that retrieves data and employs in the framework, where data from a data-level is used in producing the structure of the web page at the application-level (see paragraph 136). With regard to claim 8, which further teaches defining, by setting a first set of attributes of a standardized set of styles, a first plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of each of the first content module, the first navigation module, and the framework; and combining the framework, including the first content module and the first navigation module, with the attributes of the standardized set of styles to render a first user interface, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) for the UI of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure). With regard to claim 8, which further teaches said visual characteristics instantiating and displaying at least a portion of the framework after at least one content module is inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, site content being combined with a framework defining visual characteristics with a specific look and feel.

Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state a framework with a plurality of containers configure dot accept on or more modules of containers. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 28, 34, and claims 1 and 9, a framework where controls (tables) serve as containers for other controls, setting up a system with a plurality of tables with an imbedded set of

containers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the adaptable pane system of Anuff to include the hierarchical embedding of elements into tables, as did Olander. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Anuff points out the structure of sites and sub-site, which could logically be implemented in the imbedded content tables of Olander, to further organize content.

With regard to claim 8, which further teach wherein if one of said plurality of container does not contain a module or another container after creating an instance of the at least one navigation module that associates the same data type, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers, that already created for display, based on the content inserted into the container, where it would be obvious that a window with no content would effectively disappear (see paragraph 10). Kanevsky show the advantage of this in allowing for a transparent window that reveals hidden content (see above citation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content,

as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for viewing of a maximum amount of content within a container without need for scrolling and without consuming extraneous screen space.

10. With regard to claim 10, which teaches further comprising: defining, by setting a second set of attributes of the standardized set of styles, a second plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of at least one of the first content module, the first navigation module, and the framework; and combining the framework, including at least one of the first content module and the first navigation module, that change at least a portion of the instantiated framework when inserted into the instantiated framework with the second plurality of visual characteristics to render a second user interface that has a different appearance than the first user interface, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 133-135, and initial setting of a look and feel for content and navigational links in a site and then a defining of a second set of look and feel style characteristics for a site, different from the first, that are then used for effecting the display of the UI on the display.

11. With regard to claim 11, which teaches further comprising: inserting at least one of at least a second content module and at least a second navigation module into one of said plurality of containers in the framework; defining, by setting a second set of attributes for the standardized set of styles, a second plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of each of the second content module, the second navigation module, and the framework; and combining the framework, including at least one of the second content module and the second navigation module, that change at least a portion of the instantiated framework when inserted into the instantiated framework with the

second plurality of visual characteristics to render a second user interface that has a different appearance than the first user interface, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 133 and 135, a plurality of sets of content objects/pages, and further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 140, a plurality of sets of navigational components. Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 133, associating different styles with different elements (pages) in the webpage, and grouping the elements (pages) to form a single theme.

12. With regard to claim 17, which further teaches a computer-readable medium containing computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 8, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 13, a computer-readable medium containing computer-executable instructions for implementing site customization.

13. With regard to claim 19, which teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-readable modules of a user interface, the computer readable medium comprising: at least one content module that contains content to be displayed via the user interface; at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements, where the interface optionally doesn't have a default branding. With regard to claim 19, which further teaches a framework module including a first table and a second table both having a plurality of containers, wherein the at least one navigation module is inserted into at least one of the containers of the first table and the at least one content module is inserted into at least one of the containers of the second table, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links, where a plurality

of containers (panes) are configured to accept content (see paragraph 157 and figure 18). With regard to claim 19, which further teaches a database descriptor, and a framework related to a data-level to an application-level relationship of the at least one content module that contains content, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 53, and 76, which teach a database management system that retrieves data and employs in the framework, where data from a data-level is used in producing the structure of the web page at the application-level (see paragraph 136).

With regard to claim 19, which further teaches a standardized set of styles attributes of which are set to define a plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of each of: the at least one content module, the at least one navigation module, and the framework, Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure). With regard to claim 19, which further teaches said visual characteristics instantiating and displaying at least a portion of the framework after at least one content module is inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, site content being combined with a framework defining visual characteristics with a specific look and feel.

Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state a framework with two tables both having a plurality of containers. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that

of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 28, 34, and claims 1 and 9, a framework where controls (tables) serve as containers for other controls, setting up a system with a plurality of tables with an imbedded set of containers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the adaptable pane system of Anuff to include the hierarchical embedding of elements into tables, as did Olander. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Anuff points out the structure of sites and sub-site, which could logically be implemented in the imbedded content tables of Olander, to further organize content.

With regard to claim 19, which further teach wherein if one of said plurality of container does not contain a module or another container after creating an instance of the at least one navigation module that associates the same data type, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers, that already created for display, based on the content inserted into the container, where it would be obvious that a window with no content would effectively disappear (see paragraph 10). Kanevsky show the advantage of this in allowing for a transparent window that reveals hidden content (see above citation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander,

and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for viewing of a maximum amount of content within a container without need for scrolling and without consuming extraneous screen space.

14. With regard to claim 20, which further teaches wherein when a content module or navigation module is inserted into one of said plurality of containers, the container expands to fit the inserted content module or the inserted navigation module, Anuff and Olander teach defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133 of Anuff), but don't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where a user sets a minimum and a maximum window dimension. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allow for viewing of a maximum amount of content within a container without need for scrolling.

15. With regard to claim 23, which further teaches wherein the plurality of visual characteristics are selected from: colors; heights, widths, spacing around an element,

spacing within an element, background images, borders, and fonts, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 134, and 135, visual characteristics including colors, fonts (letter height and width), layout characteristics, image files, and spacing around elements, for applying specific style attributes to content.

16. With regard to claim 25, which teaches wherein if one of said plurality of container does not contain a module or another container, the container shrinks thereby effectively disappearing when the user interface is displayed, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where it would be obvious that a window with no content would effectively disappear. Kanevsky show the advantage of this in allowing for a transparent window that reveals hidden content (see above citation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allows for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling and without consuming extraneous screen space.

17. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al., Pub. No.: US 2003/0056026 A1, hereinafter Anuff, and Olander et al., Pub. No.: US 2005/0005243 A1, hereinafter Olander.

18. With regard to claim 24, which teaches a flexible framework system for adaptable database relationships between at least one content module to support user interfaces, the system comprising: at least one content module that contains content, wherein the content is unformatted with respect to visual characteristics; at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements, where the interface optionally doesn't have a default branding. With regard to claim 24, which further teaches a framework related to a data-level to an application-level relationship of the at least one content module that contains content including a plurality of containers configured to accept one or more modules or containers, wherein at least one of the at least one content module and the at least one navigation module are inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 53, and 76, which teach a system that retrieves data and employs in the framework, where data from a data-level is used in producing the structure of the web page at the application-level (see paragraph 136). Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links, where a plurality of containers (panes) are configured to accept content (see paragraph 157 and figure 18). With regard to claim 24, which further teaches a formatting specification that includes a standardized set of flexible styles, attribute of which are set for defining a plurality of

visual characteristics of at least one of the at least one content module, the at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure). With regard to claim 24, which further teaches said visual characteristics instantiating and displaying at least a portion of the framework after at least one content module is inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, site content being combined with a framework defining visual characteristics with a specific look and feel.

Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state a framework with a plurality of containers configured to accept on or more modules or containers. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 28, 34, and claims 1 and 9, a framework where controls (tables) serve as containers for other controls, setting up a system with a plurality of tables with an imbedded set of containers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the adaptable pane system of Anuff to include the hierarchical embedding of elements into tables, as did Olander. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Anuff points out the structure of sites and sub-site, which could

logically be implemented in the imbedded content tables of Olander, to further organize content.

Response to Arguments

The arguments filed on 7-1-2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

The applicants' argue that there is a distinction because the administrative privileges are for a specific site administrator.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits that the site administrator as taught by Anuff is a user with a defined set of permission associated with the software, where this is the exact field the Anuff reference concerns itself with (see paragraph 3). It is unclear how this is distinguishable by the applicant's argument.

The applicants' again argue that assertions by the Examiner that reference a "window" indicate that the Examiner is not looking at the data level" further stating

In response, the examiner respectfully submits that he is unsure of which particular recitation to "window" the applicant is referring, but notes that what the Applicant's appear to be arguing is not recited by the claims. The Examiner recommends claiming what exactly happens in the application-level and at the data-level (and interaction therebetween), that is above what is admitted "the adaptation that is of the container based upon specific content takes place at the data level, therefore

when certain data types are interconnected, at the data-level, the framework that would support any visual manifestation at the application-level makes the necessary adaptation." where "These are fundamental tenants with regards to object classes" (see page 13 of the 7-1-2008 Remarks).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DENNIS G. BONSHOCK** whose telephone number is (571)272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10-14-08
dgb

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

10/607,665

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

RASMUSSEN ET AL.

Examiner

DENNIS G. BONSHOCK

Art Unit

2173